

THOMPSON et al.
Serial No. 09/723,319

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7 and 9-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as allegedly being "anticipated" by O'Brien (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,831).

The resource management system of claim 1 includes a work plan builder module that is configured to allow each worker to specify, for each of a plurality of different time periods during each of one or more workdays, one of a plurality of different activities that the worker plans to perform during that time period. The work plan builder module is configured to permit each worker to specify two or more different work activities that the worker plans to perform during different time periods of the same workday. An illustrative example display of a work plan builder module including these features is shown in Figure 6. The specification also describes by way of example without limitation that work activities include activities such as answering regular mail, answering e-mail and answering telephone calls.

O'Brien does not disclose a work plan builder module that includes the above-underlined features of claim 1. In particular, Figure 2A of O'Brien simply shows the shift assignment (*e.g.*, 6:00 am to 10:00 am; 10:00 am to 2:00 pm; etc.) for each employee for a given schedule period. There is however no disclosure or suggestion therein of a worker being able to specify two or more different work activities within a workday or a particular one of these shift assignments. Thus, O'Brien is fundamentally different than the resource management system of claim 1.

The office action erroneously focuses on the outputs of the scheduling system shown in Figures 2A and 2B of O'Brien. See, *e.g.*, col. 2, lines 44-45 ("FIG. 2A is an exemplary schedule ...generated in accordance with the preferred embodiment.") (emphasis added); and col. 2, lines

THOMPSON et al.
Serial No. 09/723,319

46-47 ("FIG. 2B is an exemplary detailed schedule ... generated in accordance with the preferred embodiment.") (emphasis added). These Figures do not disclose or suggest the concept of the workers specifying the activities in which they plan to engage during a plurality of time periods. Rather, these Figures show the shift assignments for workers after they are generated by the scheduling system.

For at least these reasons, O'Brien cannot anticipate the resource management system of claim 1. Claims 7, 9-13 and 17 depend from claim 1. These claims are believed to be allowable because of this dependency and because of the additional patentable features recited therein.

As for claim 14, this claim recites a method in which a work plan is received from each of a plurality of workers, wherein the work plan for at least one of the workers specifies two or more different work activities that the at least one worker plans to perform during different time periods of the same workday. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, O'Brien fails to disclose (or even suggest) the concept of a worker specifying different work activities within a workday. Consequently, claim 14 and its dependent claims 15, 16 and 18 cannot be anticipated by O'Brien.

Claims 2, 3 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over O'Brien. Even assuming (without agreeing) that it could be established that the features of these dependent claims would have been obvious, O'Brien is deficient with respect to claim 1 for the reasons set forth above. Consequently, claims 2, 3 and 8 (which depend from claim 1) are believed to patentably distinguish over O'Brien for at least this reason.

Applicants note the contentions in the office action regarding the different work activities specified in claims 2 and 22. Even if answering telephone calls, answering e-mails, etc. are viewed as well-known work activities, there is nothing in O'Brien suggestive of allowing a

THOMPSON et al.
Serial No. 09/723,319

worker to specify that he/she plans to perform different ones of these activities during different time periods of the same work day as specified in claim 1.

Claim 4-6 and 19-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over O'Brien in view of the National Finance Center documents.

Claim 19 is directed to computer-readable storage having stored thereon a work plan builder module for enabling workers to build their own work plans for one or more workdays, the work plan builder module being configured to allow each worker to specify two or more different work activities to engage in during different time periods of the same workday. As explained above, O'Brien does not, among other things, contain any disclosure whatsoever regarding a work plan builder module that is configured to allow each worker to specify two or more different work activities to engage in during different time periods of the same workday.

The National Finance Center documents are described in the office action as disclosing the ability to take leave in time periods less than a full day. See 1/9/2006 Office Action, page 14. The office action concludes that this would have made it obvious to modify O'Brien so that different activities (i.e., work and leave) could be specified during different time periods of the same workday. See 1/9/2006 Office Action, pages 14-15.

While Applicants traverse this contention, The National Finance Center documents do not, in any event, disclose or suggest specifying two or more different work activities during different time periods of the same workday. As such, claim 19 and its dependent claims 20-42 are believed to patentably distinguish over the proposed combination of O'Brien and the National Finance Center documents.

Moreover, the National Finance Center documents are in the context of providing a web site through which a person can access certain personal information. Applicants respectfully

THOMPSON et al.
Serial No. 09/723,319

submit that such a web site would not have made it obvious to modify O'Brien as proposed in the office action.

The method of managing resources of claim 43 involves receiving from each of one or more workers a work plan in which the worker specifies a first work activity for a first time period during a workday and a second different work activity for a second different time period during the same workday. As explained above, neither O'Brien nor the National Finance Center documents disclose or suggest the concept of specifying different work activities during different time periods of the same workday and thus claim 43 and its dependent claims 44-46 are believed to patentably distinguish over the proposed combination of O'Brien and the National Finance Center documents.


Claims 4-6 depend from claim 1 which, as discussed above, involves a work plan builder module that is configured to permit each worker to specify two or more different work activities that the worker plans to perform during different time periods of the same workday. As discussed above, this concept is not present in O'Brien, in the National Finance Center documents, or in the proposed combination thereof. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the proposed combination of O'Brien and the National Finance Center documents does not render claims 4-6 obvious.

THOMPSON et al.
Serial No. 09/723,319

The pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100